

March 12, 1974

the pipe that does have a chance of working. Where you have a tightly controlled means of knowing who contributes, who gets the money out of the campaign, so that it is laid out. All you are doing is saying that these are the people that gave. These are the people that received. And then you are leaving it up to the people to decide whether they want their political candidate receiving this amount of money from this kind of source and whether they want him spending it in this way. I really think this is the best solution that has been proposed yet. And perhaps if the idea has any fault at all, it's too good of an idea. Too significant of it's change to be acceptable immediately. But I do oppose the kill motion.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers do you want to be heard again on the issue.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I think what ought to be recognized by the Legislature here is that the whole body of election falls in the state need to be gone over thoroughly and a complete revision be undertaken. A piecemeal patching here and there is not going to solve the problems that confront this state. Even the team idea of the Governor and the Lt. Governor would not thoroughly researched as important as those two offices are. This is an attempt to respond in haste to something that has everybody says been going on for years as long as this country has been a country. And that's political corruption. It cannot be hastily done during one session of the Legislature prior to any gathering together of all of the election laws that relate on these issues, and seeing which ones ought to be retained, which ones ought to be done away with. But as far as this particular bill is concerned, in the penalty section whoever is found guilty, whoever violates this is guilty of a misdemeanor. I don't know whether the county attorney would be the one to complain to, I don't know whether an appeal should be made to the Attorney General's office to enforce the law, or whether it should be done on the local level by going to the city attorney. But at any rate the only way you could find somebody guilty of this law is to find a transaction that was undertaken in violation of it. If an individual is upset about this law. He or she could conduct one hundred small transactions in a month. Send each one of those individual transactions to the Secretary of State, and hold back one. If I was going to accuse somebody of violating this law, I would have to know the date, and the specific transaction which I am going to accuse that person of having engaged in in violation of this law. Then you go to the Secretary of State's office go through all of the pieces of paper that person sent and find the one missing which would have covered this particular transaction. It is impractical. It is unworkable. It is unreasonable. And when the Secretary of State came before the committee, he cannot very well speak against these bills because he is not supposed to lobby. He was trying to explain how he could go about administering this..a bill like this and he pointed out some deficiencies but as it stands now, if somebody had telephone bills after the campaign, the person wouldn't have to pay for the telephone bills. Even though there are other regulations, there is an agency much stronger than the state of Nebraska which governs telephone. So I think the bill in it's present form. The bill in an amended form is not going to do anything worthwhile. There are times when I think it is good to let the public see what is being done